REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16, and 18 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 8, and 12 are currently amended. No claims are cancelled or newly added by this amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimata (CIT 2004, IEEE; "Kimata") in view of Puri (Signal Processing Image Communication 2, 1990, pp. 127-144; "Puri"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimata in view of Puri, and further in view of Eifrig (U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,447; "Eifrig"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant amends claims 1, 5, 8, and 12 to clearly show that GOPs of the present invention correspond to different viewing positions or directions. The amendments are generally supported by the original English specification of the present application. For example, the third paragraph on page 4 of the specification recites that:

Generally in such a video generating technique, when the same subject is included in input images obtained by a plurality of cameras, image data of the subject corresponding to a viewing position or direction at or in which no photographing is performed is generated using the obtained image data. That is, image data for a subject which is present over input images obtained by a plurality of cameras is generated using part of each input image. [Emphasis added.]

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define patentable

subject matter over the applied combination of references. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly

traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 12, 2011

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/_

Gregory A. Stobbs

Reg. No. 28,764

GAS/dec

P.O. Box 828

(248) 641-1600

Serial No. 10/588,404

Page 10 of 10

16017025.1